



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,844	07/29/2005	Richard Belanger	6013-106US	7204
20988	7590	12/20/2007	EXAMINER	
OGILVY RENAULT LLP			HANLEY, SUSAN MARIE	
1981 MCGILL COLLEGE AVENUE				
SUITE 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONTREAL, QC H3A2Y3			1651	
CANADA				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/20/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/519,844	BELANGER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Susan Hanley	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-10 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/19/06/5/10/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The originally filed claims were numbered 1-6. The claim amendment filed 10/10/07 was entered. Claims 1-6 were cancelled and new claims 7-14 were added. Claims 7-10 are drawn to compounds and, therefore, correspond to Group I of the restriction requirement. New claims 11-13 are drawn to the use of the compound and correspond to restriction group II. Claim 14 is drawn to a method for preparing the claimed compounds and corresponds to restriction group III.

Claims 7-14 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of I, claims 7-10, in the reply filed on 8/17/07 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 12-14 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 8/17/07.

Claims 7-10 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in

the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 7 recites the structure of formula I. Formula I is not described in the specification, as filed, because its structure does not correspond to any compound disclosed in the specification. Formula I of claim 7 depicts a long carbon chain bonded to an oxygen which is bonded to the anomeric carbon of the monosaccharide. This chain, beginning at the oxygen bond to the ring and ending at the variable "L" has 13 carbon atoms. This determination was made by counting each kink in the chain as a carbon atom. Claim 7 recites that "L" is an ethyl group (kink counts as one carbon plus the methyl group) or a alpha-hydroxy carboxylic acid. It is unclear to which carbon (the alpha or beta carbon) L attaches. When L is an ethyl group, the chain length is 15 carbons. Assuming L attaches at the beta-carbon of the alternate L substituent, the chain length is 16 carbons. The specification do not describe any compounds having these chain lengths.

In fact, the specification is quite variable regarding the length of this long chain. The structures of Fig. 1 and formula (1) on page 3 pf the specification show that the chain in question has 18 carbons when the structure corresponds to flocculosin. However, formula (1) on page 2 of the specification depicts a cellobiose disaccharide having a chain of 14 carbons between the oxygen bonded to the ring and "L". On page 3 of the specification, L has two possibilities, one of which is a propyl group. When L is a propyl group, the chain has 17 carbons which does not correspond to the chain length of flocculosin or the structure of claim 7.

Furthermore, the claimed substituents for L are not described by the specification. On page 6, L is defined as a propyl group or an alpha-hydroxy carboxylic acid. In the claims, L is recited as an ethyl group or a beta-hydroxy acid.

According to the specification as-filed, the microorganism *Pseudozyma flocculosa* (ATCC 64874) produces flocculosin having a chain length of exactly 18 carbons. The compounds of claim 1 do not have this feature and, therefore, are not described by the specification. Furthermore, the limitations recited for L in claim 1 are not described by the specification. Because the claims encompass compounds s neither contemplated nor disclosed by the as-filed disclosure, it is clear that applicant was not in possession of the full scope of the claimed subject matter at the time of filing.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The microorganism *Pseudozyma flocculosa* (ATCC 64874) is essential to the invention recited in claims 7-10 because it is the only microorganism that makes the desired antimicrobial compound. It must therefore be obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification or otherwise be readily available to the public. If the microorganism is not so obtainable or available, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 may be satisfied by a deposit of the microorganism. The specification does not disclose a repeatable process to obtain the microorganism and it is not apparent if the microorganism is readily available to the public. It is noted that applicants have deposited the organism but there is no indication in the specification as to public availability.

If the deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicants, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific strain will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposit meets the criteria set forth in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.801-1.809, applicants may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer; and
- (d) the deposit will be replaced if it should ever become inviable.

Applicant is directed to 37 CFR § 1.807(b), which states:

- (b) A viability statement for each deposit of a biological material defined in paragraph (a) of this section not made under the Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure must be filed in the application and must contain:
 - (1) The name and address of the depository;
 - (2) The name and address of the depositor;
 - (3) The date of deposit;
 - (4) The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
 - (5) The date of the viability test;
 - (6) The procedures used to obtain a sample if the test is not done by the depository; and
 - (7) A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

Applicant is also directed to 37 CFR § 1.809(d) which states:

- (d) For each deposit made pursuant to these regulations, the specification shall contain:
 - (1) The accession number for the deposit;
 - (2) The date of the deposit;
 - (3) A description of the deposited biological material sufficient to specifically identify it and to permit examination; and
 - (4) The name and address of the depository.

Lastly, with respect to the issue of enablement, it is noted that the deposited organism is disclosed as being the sole source of a new antibiotic. Thus, the skilled artisan would expect to

Art Unit: 1651

have to undertake a trial and error process, without any guidance as to other potential source organisms, to obtain the enzyme from any organism other than applicant's deposited organism. Such a trial and error process clearly amounts to undue experimentation.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7-9 are rejected because it is unclear to which carbon of the beta-hydroxy carboxylic acid the chain is attached.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Hanley whose telephone number is 571-272-2508. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Hanley
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1651

SANDRA E. SAUCIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
